



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dotto and the *Ignorante* by the Jesuit fathers in Rome to-day, is distinctly dramatic and is dramatically performed by two preachers, one of whom imitates the man of the people and even talks in the Roman dialect. Some allusion is made by Chambers to the use of dialogue by the minstrels and in Christian writings, etc., but there is no real treatment of this field.

The work stands superficial tests for accuracy very well indeed, in spite of the fact that it fails the first tests put — Voragine did not die in 1275 (II. 126) but in 1298, and the Coventry Weaver's play was not burned with Sharp's collection, although its rediscovery at Coventry by H. Craig (to whose forthcoming edition of the plays Chambers refers) is too recent for use here. Moreover, "a knowledge of Seneca or of Plautus" is not quite "the rarest of things" (II. 207), at least in the thirteenth century, if one may judge from certain writers of this period whom the reviewer happens to be reading at the time of writing this review, for they make quotations by the score from both these writers. But, considering the immense mass and variety of material crowded into this work, the tests reveal surprisingly few slips or inaccuracies.

The book is written in a style which makes interesting reading in spite of the necessary scholarly references and the unnecessary peppering with quasi-technical words given in their originals as if untranslatable. On the whole the work is one not only attractive and profitable to read but useful also as an introductory guide, and that not merely to the subject in general but also to the multitudinous special topics introduced under each general theme.

In the matter of bibliographical reference, the thirty-page list of authorities at the beginning is a somewhat miscellaneous list of books consulted, with much that is only indirect in its bearing, but it is useful enough; and the bibliographical notes at the beginnings of chapters and in foot-notes are models of practical bibliographical method. The make-up of the book with its handsome typography and unusually light paper is very pleasing. Not least among its attractions is the fact that the well-proportioned margins are not too wide and the fair-sized type and leadings are not excessive. It is a normal book, not watered either by author or publisher and not condensed beyond nature. The only suspicion of skimping is in the index and this, although made on a somewhat meager plan, is intelligently made and fills the decent amount of nineteen pages.

ERNEST C. RICHARDSON.

The Angevin Empire, or the Three Reigns of Henry II., Richard I., and John (A. D., 1154-1216). By SIR JAMES H. RAMSAY, of Bamff, M.A. (London: Swan, Sonnenschein, and Company, Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv, 556.)

THIS is the last instalment of Sir James H. Ramsay's great work. It covers the combined reigns of the first three Angevins, and thus

brings the reader down to the death of John, A. D. 1216. The scope of the work, however, is not so broad as the title might lead one to suppose. What little space is devoted to constitutional or social questions is given almost entirely to England. Even Ireland receives only meager treatment, while that vast agglomeration of lordships which was held by English kings as vassals of foreign overlords, and which yet formed such an important part of the "Angevin Empire", is neglected almost altogether. On the other hand, the author has followed with characteristic industry the Angevin kings in their ceaseless goings and comings, their never-ending itineraries, as far as it is possible to restore or confirm, — a species of historical investigation which, although of little interest to the general reader, is of considerable importance to the student, especially if the work is done well and finally. Whether Sir James has attained this end or not can be determined only by a careful examination of his processes. In the main it may be said that upon almost every page he gives evidence of the same patient industry, the same devotion to accuracy in matters of detail, the same conscientious fidelity in the description of events, that have placed the *Foundations of England* in the class with the best models of the modern school of history-writers.

The author's purpose, as he modestly states in his preface, has been to verify and confirm by an independent survey of the original authorities, and to present "facts rather than impressions". Hence he has no brilliant discoveries to announce; no novel and startling interpretations of old texts to exploit; no slashing criticisms to develop. He is always conservative in exposition, clinging tenaciously to old and accepted views, and surrendering them when he must always with reluctance.

In his estimate of men and actions the author rarely betrays enthusiasm; he always looks at his heroes through an inverted glass. His Henry II. is a busy king, whose feverish activities never cease; he is as tireless as a fiend, but he is far from the statesman-sovereign whose picture Stubbs has drawn with such a masterly hand in his introduction to the so-called Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough. According to Sir James, Henry's statecraft has no higher inspiration than an innate love of power, directed in later years by the immediate purpose of finding portions for his graceless sons. It is, therefore, petty and short-sighted; and in the end is defeated by the very sons whom he would favor. He is ignorant of human nature, and has little knowledge of the economic or social forces which surround him. All in all, for the student of constitutional institutions his reign is a dismal failure. As might be expected, where the father fails to secure favor, Richard fares worse. Even his title to respect as a master of the art of war is denied him; although Sir James does betray some enthusiasm when describing the conduct of the battle of "Arsûf". For John, however, the author has only contempt: far from being "the ablest and most ruthless of the Angevins", John is a lusterless tyrant, hopelessly depraved, and without ability either in war or politics to redeem the fathomless evil of his nature. For the less con-

spicuous figures whose names are connected with the Angevin history the author has more patience but hardly more admiration. Becket is a martyr but no saint; "with all his Biblical jargon he fought as a politician", and in a bad cause. For Hubert Walter or William Marshal the author has slight respect; their faithful service of bad masters is not to their credit. Even Langton, the traditional hero of the Great Charter, appears, if not a self-willed egoist as Becket, at least as a church-seeking prelate who rises no whit above the selfish interests of his class.

Upon most of the disputed points connected with the Angevin era the author is inclined to take conservative ground. He sustains Bémont against Guilhaumez in rejecting the second condemnation of John, but refuses to follow Miss Norgate in rejecting the first condemnation. In discussing the origin of trial by jury, he thinks that Pollock and Maitland have been too ready to "bow to German authorities", and while conceding to Brunner the continental origin of the inquest by royal writ, he insists upon the direct connection of the accusing thanes of Ethelred's time with the sworn inquisitors of Henry II., who thus "present a link between the jurors of the old English gemot and the modern grand jury".

Upon either of these questions Sir James certainly has a right to his view, and his position will doubtless receive due consideration from the scholars who continue the investigation of these topics. In discussing the alleged grant of Ireland to Henry by Pope Adrian, however, the author fairly lays himself open to the charge of unfamiliarity with recent literature upon this subject. The Bull of Adrian, he says, "has been fiercely assailed, for very obvious reasons, by zealous Romanists, and patriotic Irishmen". True enough, but is this all? The author ought to know that the men who have destroyed the credibility of the famous bull are neither "zealous Romanists" nor "patriotic Irishmen". He is evidently familiar with Mr. Round's essay in *The Commune of London*, but in a marvelous foot-note on page 7 he virtually confesses that he has read neither Scheffer-Boichorst nor Pflugk-Harttung. The simple *credo* of Sir James, therefore, in which he announces his unqualified acceptance of *Laudabiliter*, can have little weight. His position, moreover, is hardly strengthened by the further statement: "even if it [the bull] should prove to be a concoction there would still remain ample evidence that the Papacy was accessory, both before and after the fact, to the invasion of Ireland by Henry." Here the author certainly shifts his case to firmer ground, for it was long ago shown conclusively by Scheffer-Boichorst that the question of the spuriousness of *Laudabiliter* is entirely distinct from the question of papal responsibility. But unfortunately Mr. Ramsay's "ample evidence" has also been thoroughly sifted, and not only has Adrian been freed from all responsibility for the English seizure of Ireland, but it has been further shown that after the English had taken forcible possession, Henry tried in vain to persuade three successive popes to confirm his title.

In his treatment of the Becket controversy the author appears to write not in the dignified temper of the historian, but with the animus of

the polemical writer. In the preface, in fact, he coolly avows that in obedience to the demands of the times, he proposes to use the Becket matter to show to the world what the words, "the Liberty of the Church", imported when those words had a living meaning. Now, without questioning Sir James's judgment of Becket, it does not follow that Becket's view of "the liberties of the church" was the accepted view in the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, few of the English bishops supported Becket; even Alexander evidently regarded him as a troublesome radical to be restrained rather than encouraged, while later popes, noticeably Innocent III., expressly rejected the principle upon which Becket based his whole contention. The decree of Innocent is the law of the Roman church to-day.

The animus of the author toward things or persons churchly is still more apparent in his treatment of Langton and the Charter; and whatever may be the reader's concurrence in the use which the author would make of the Becket controversy, few will follow him here. Sir James declares that the provisions of the Charter which pertained to the church were "sweeping and extravagant. Archbishop Langton had not given his support to the Barons for nothing. The first words of the Charter proclaim the absolute 'liberty' of the Church in the fullest sense. This 'liberty', as then understood, involved the surrender of all that Henry II. had contended for in his Constitutions of Clarendon; it would relieve the clergy of all lay control, and of all liability to contribute to the needs of the State beyond the occasional scutages due from the higher clergy for their knights' fees. The clergy would be in the happy position of having their property and rights protected for them *gratis*, by Courts whose decisions if adverse to themselves they would be free to reject. The grant of the absolute 'liberty' of the Church, with the free canonical election already granted and now expressly confirmed, would establish a self-elected corporation as the ruling power in the Kingdom" (p. 475). Prejudice could hardly go farther than this, if not in misstating, surely in misunderstanding the spirit and purpose of historical action. As a matter of fact, never at any time were the words "liberty of the church" so closely or so explicitly defined. In one generation they meant one thing, in another, another thing, as the church was compelled to defend some new point along the line of its activities against the encroachment of royal or baronial tyrannies. With few exceptions the stand taken by the champions of church liberties has been justified by the modern world, because, as Palgrave long ago put it, "The liberties of the Church were the franchises of the nation." Neither the Charter of November nor the Great Charter of June following warrant us in believing that Langton sought any such results as Sir James here recounts. If any man of the thirteenth century had a definite conception of what the words "liberty of the church" meant, that man was Innocent III.; and Innocent would have been the last to reject the archbishop of his own making for committing himself to the service of "the liberties of the church". But Innocent suspended Langton and left a successor to reinstate him;

and the inference certainly is just, that the humiliation of Langton was due not to the fact that he favored the liberties of the church, but to the fact that he had championed the liberties of England against the tyrannies of the pope's new vassal — the impossible John. It is true that the Constitutions of Clarendon had been nominally dropped by Henry as a result of the tragic end of the Becket matter, and yet, within two years of the death of Becket, Henry had secured the right of the forest courts to try and to punish clerks for breaches of the forest laws, and from that time the civil courts had quietly but steadily resumed the jurisdiction of clerical cases of various kinds, until in the thirteenth century the final authority of the church courts was recognized only in a few capital cases. In John's day the question of civil jurisdiction was virtually settled, and among the grievances brought forth by the church the encroachments of the civil courts upon the church courts is not mentioned. In Edward I.'s reign, as we near the end of the century, we shall find another archbishop, Winchelsea, boldly claiming that church-land ought to be exempt from taxation by the state, and still later, on the eve of the final severance from Rome, we shall find Archbishop Warham virtually declaring the legislative independence of the church from the national parliament. Yet in Langton's day such issues were entirely remote to men's thoughts, nor did the term "liberty of the church" mean anything more than exemption from the shameless plundering of John or exemption from direct royal interference in ecclesiastical elections. As for the rest, the taxing of church property or the abuse of jurisdiction, Langton apparently was perfectly willing to cast in his lot with the nation and find protection under the general provisions of the Charter, which secured the liberties of the church to be sure, but no more than it did the liberties of the barons or the burghers.

In treating of the homage of John and the promised tribute, Mr. Ramsay has overworked the evidences of national humiliation and mortification. Neither of his authorities, Walter of Coventry or Matthew of Paris, is strictly contemporary. Both were bitterly antipapal and wrote out of the midst of the fires of the thirteenth century, when the papal overlordship had become a very patent and a very irritating fact. There is no evidence that in the early part of the century there had been yet quickened in England any of the later bitter antipapal feeling. On the contrary, the barons at the time of the homage of John regarded the affair with no ill-favor, and later at the time of the papal interference in the affair of the Charter virtually claimed in their protest against Innocent's action that they had forced John to enter into the new vassal relation. Up to this point, in fact, they apparently regarded the pope as their best protector against the tyrannies of John. Forty years later, however, when papal interference and papal exaction had taught them to look upon the church with anything but filial affection, men began to talk of "humiliation" and "mortification".

The peculiarities of Sir James Ramsay's style are so well known that it is hardly necessary to refer to them again. The book is sadly in need

of careful editing. It is to be regretted that when an author has evidently spent so much labor in the effort to secure accuracy of detail, his work should be marred by careless proof-reading. The text is fairly clear, but some of the foot-notes are beyond description. For example, see the note on page 7, where not only are the names of Scheffer-Boichorst and Pflugk-Harttung misspelled, but four other errors also appear in the titles of the periodicals in which their respective essays occur, nor is either date of publication given correctly.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898. Edited by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES A. ROBERTSON. Vol. VII., 1588-1591; Vol. VIII., 1591-1593; Vol. IX., 1593-1597. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1903. Pp. 320, 320, 329.)

TAKEN as a whole, Volume VII. presents us more enlightening data as to the early history of the Philippines under Spain than any of those that have preceded it in the series. This is due primarily to its containing the celebrated relations by Friar Juan de Plasencia of the "Customs of the Tagalogs" (1589); the letters to the king and his Council of the Indies from Bishop Salazar, Santiago de Vera, and other members of the first audiencia, and the king's careful instructions to Gomez Perez Das-mariñas.

There are so many points of probability in his favor that we can hardly resist giving the palm to Bishop Salazar in his controversy with the lay conquerors who have become *encomenderos* of natives (having districts of from 1,500 to 10,000 population assigned to them), charging them with abuse and even torture of the Indians in order to secure their annual tributes of one peso, and, with few exceptions, of giving them nothing in return in the way of protection or instruction (through missionaries). Unfortunately the peppery bishop has left us, even on paper, very fair proof that most of the charges brought against him by the other parties to the controversy were true. He engaged in petty wrangles over precedence with the first audiencia; he interfered with the civil jurisdiction of the king, and for the first time brought to bear a weapon that for long thereafter should play a large part in securing ecclesiastical domination of the Philippines, *viz.*, excommunication; he refused absolution and condemned men to hell who did not act in accordance with his views; he conspired with his brother Dominicans to oust the Augustinians from their mission-work among the Chinese in Manila, and gain it and a future entrance into China for his own order; he patronizingly praised the king for sending a new governor to replace the man with whom he had quarreled, then promptly quarreled with the new-comer; and he lectured the king when the latter issued decrees not to his liking. All this is not incompatible with the truth of his charge against the *encomenderos*, and the probability is that he exaggerated very little in saying, "Through their presence, [they] work more injury to the Indians by the many grievances which they occasion, and the bad